



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

H.F.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,221	04/16/2004	Johannes Mathias Theodorus Antonius Adriaens	081468-0308940	7266
909	7590	11/01/2006	EXAMINER	
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP			LYONS, MICHAEL A	
P.O. BOX 10500			ART UNIT	
MCLEAN, VA 22102			PAPER NUMBER	
			2877	

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/825,221	Applicant(s) ADRIAENS ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael A. Lyons	Art Unit 2877	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 September 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 8-9 are objected to because of the following informalities: The claims, in their amended portions, cite the limitation “the interferometric displacement measuring system”.

While there is no lack of antecedent basis for this limitation, due to amended claim 1, the current language of the claim incorporates a structural limitation into a method claim in a manner that makes the claim unclear. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding claims 8 and 10, although the claims are directed to a statutory class of invention (in this instance, a process), the claims are directed to a judicial exception; as such, pursuant to the Interim Guidelines on Patent Eligible Subject Matter (MPEP 2106), the claims must have either physical transformation and/or a useful, concrete, and tangible result. The claims fail to include transformation from one physical state to another, and although the claims appear to be useful and concrete, there does not appear to be a tangible result claimed. Merely determining displacements as a function of stage-rotation and stage position, and determining interferometer model parameters, including coefficients for terms dependent on a variable representing beamshear of a measurement beam, using a least square fit, would not appear to be sufficient to constitute a tangible result, since the outcome of the determination step has not been

Art Unit: 2877

used in a disclosed practical application nor made available in such a manner that its usefulness in a disclosed practical application can be realized. As such, the subject matter of the claims is not patent eligible.

Further, MPEP 2106 states, "In making this determination, the focus is not on whether the steps taken to achieve a particular result are useful, tangible, and concrete, but rather on whether the final result achieved by the claimed invention is 'useful, tangible, and concrete'".

Regarding claim 9, the claim is drawn to a computer program per se. A computer program, per se, is a set of abstract instructions. Therefore, a computer program is not a physical thing (product), nor a process as it is not an "act" being performed. As such, this claim is not directed to one of the statutory categories of invention (see MPEP 2106.01), but is directed to nonstatutory functional descriptive material.

It is noted that computer programs embodied on a computer readable medium or other structure, which would permit the functionality of the program to be realized, would be directed to a product and be within a statutory category of invention, so long as the computer readable medium is not disclosed as non-statutory subject matter per se (signals or carrier waves).

Additionally, regarding claim 9, the functionality of the instructions in the computer code, if placed on an appropriate computer readable medium, would also be non-statutory for the reasons set forth above regarding claims 8 and 10.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-7 are allowed in view of the prior art.

Claims 8-10 would be allowed in view of the prior art should the 35 USC 101 rejections set forth above be properly overcome.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

As for claims 1 and 8-10, the prior art of record, taken either alone or in combination, fails to disclose or render obvious the various interferometric methods and apparatus, the methods and apparatus including, in combination with other essential elements, determining displacements as a function of state-rotation and stage position, and determining interferometer model parameters, including coefficients for terms dependent on a variable for beamshear of a measurement beam, using a least square fit, in combination with the rest of the limitations of the above claim.

For further reasoning, see the applicants' arguments dated September 27, 2006 in response to the previous Office action of record.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed September 27, 2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-9 under 35 USC 102 and claim 10 under 35 USC 112 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of the 35 USC 101 rejections as per MPEP 2106 as set forth above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael A. Lyons whose telephone number is 571-272-2420. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory J. Toatley can be reached on 571-272-2800 ext. 77. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2877

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael A. Lyons", followed by a large, stylized, horizontal oval flourish.

Michael A. Lyons
Patent Examiner
October 28, 2006